

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/302,687	Applicant(s) DIETZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Jennifer N. To	Art Unit 2195	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jennifer N. To. (3)_____.

(2) Roger A. Heppermann. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 04 August 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Rosenof fails to teach the limitation of automatically deriving relationships among portions of said process event information and batch subprocedure event information based on generated event message.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: 1) Applicant agreed with examiner that Rosenof teaches automatically deriving relationships among batches or at least among portions of said process event information and batch procedure event information based on generated event message. The prior art did not specifically teach the deriving relationship between the subprocedure event information and the process event information. 2) Claim 8 is a system claim that contain software alone (35 U.S. C. 101). No hardware or software/hardware combination claimed.